

ADELAIDE INSTITUTE

PO Box 3300
Adelaide 5067
Australia
Mob: 61+401692057
Email: info@adelaideinstitute.org
Web: <http://www.adelaideinstitute.org>

Online
ISSN 1440-9828



April 2014 No 757

[If Section 18C is not scrapped, then we have a TÖBEN LAW – ed. AI]

Barrister warns Barry O'Farrell of Holocaust denial risk under George Brandis' changes



Sean Nicholls

Sydney Morning Herald State Political Editor, April 7, 2014

EXCLUSIVE



"A right to be bigots": Attorney-General George Brandis. Photo: Andrew Meares

Changes to the Racial Discrimination Act proposed by federal Attorney-General George Brandis would "open the door to Holocaust deniers", allowing them to publish their claims with impunity, legal advice to NSW Premier Barry O'Farrell says.

The opinion by leading barrister Arthur Moses, SC, says the changes would "radically narrow the protection that Australian citizens will receive from racial vilification" and "undermine the very purpose" of the act.

"A new legislative right to engage in racial vilification in the course of public discussion would, for instance, open the door to Holocaust deniers to publish their opinions on websites and on social media in the course of 'public discussion'," he writes in the opinion handed to Mr O'Farrell on Friday.

Senator Brandis plans to abolish section 18C of the Racial Discrimination Act, which makes it unlawful to

publicly "offend, insult, humiliate or intimidate" a person. Section 18D, which provides protections for freedom of speech, will be removed.

The act was used to prosecute News Corp columnist Andrew Bolt over an article he wrote attacking "fair-skinned" Aborigines.

But, in his opinion, Mr Moses cites the 2003 prosecution of Fredrick Toben over publication of his view that there were "serious doubts" the Holocaust took place and some Jewish people exaggerated the number of Jews massacred during World War II for improper reasons, including financial gain.

The full bench of the Federal Court found Dr Toben's comments were not made in "good faith" - an exception to prosecution in the existing act.

The proposed new law protects comments made "in the course of participating in the public discussion of any political, social, cultural, religious, artistic, academic or scientific matter. This exception is wide enough to allow people to publish anti-Semitic material if they demonstrate that they were participating in public discussion," Mr Moses says.

He says Dr Toben's comments "would be allowed under the new law, which has no 'good faith' exception".

Mr O'Farrell sought the advice from Mr Moses after comments by Senator Brandis that people "do have a right to be bigots".

During debate in the Senate he declared that "in a free country, people do have rights to say things that other people find insulting or offensive or bigoted". The comments prompted protests.

Mr O'Farrell responded last week by publicly declaring that bigotry "should never be sanctioned, whether intentionally or unintentionally" and that "vilification on the grounds of race or religion is always wrong".

The proposed changes have also been criticised by Australian Human Rights Commission president Gillian Triggs.

Senator Brandis has not denied that he was forced to water down the original proposal for the bill by his cabinet colleagues.

One minister previously said, "George has really drunk the right-wing Kool-Aid" while a second minister said the original proposal had been "much worse".

Senator Brandis is out of the country. A spokesman did not respond to a request for comment.

<http://www.smh.com.au/federalpolitics/politicalnews/barrister-warnsbarryofarrellofholocaustdenialriskundergeorgebrandischanges20140406366r8.html#ixzz2y9c4Skrj>

From: Fredrick Toben [mailto:toben@toben.biz]

Sent: Monday, 7 April 2014 12:11 PM

To: snicholls@fairfaxmedia.com.au

Subject: The TOBEN LAW - does not permit questioning or expression of doubt if it causes hurt feelings

Mr Nicholls – what an exclusive scoop you got there!

1. For a long while the attempt has been to keep the Bolt fiction going so that free expression could be boosted through the IPA propaganda machine. Remember Chris Berg's book: *From Galileo to Bolt?* The IPA offered it for free if you joined up, which I did, but then John Roskam advised me my application could not be accepted with no reason offered.

2. I also made two submissions to the Senate Enquiry into the RDA, and attended its hearings in Melbourne and Sydney – and then was given the silent treatment by not having my submissions listed under my name but under 'Confidential'.

3. Interestingly it has been some Jews who pointed out the Holocaust scenario was behind this free speech-Bolt case and opted for a decriminalization of same, for example, Michael Gawenda, but who then quickly labeled me a 'low-life'. Dreyfus opposed an opening of the Holocaust discussion/questioning.

4. During the last few weeks *The Australian* has been pushing the IPA line, and when I tried to post my comments to three articles they were not published. So, I suppose I now continue to be the bad boy.

5. When NSW made Holocaust Studies compulsory, then I realized there was something seriously brewing and free expression was in danger of dying. However, when the Section 18C came up for review, then I felt comfortable because this change would bring us in line with the US where moral turpitude, physical threats to property and person, are actionable but not ideological matters such as the Holocaust-Shoah narrative.

6. So now I conclude that if this change does not go through, then Australia has a TÖBEN LAW, which means quite specifically that you cannot question the official Holocaust narrative.

7. We live in interesting times. Just view the Russian move to ban a Revision of Nazism, below, etc.

Kind Regards.

Fredrick Töben

Russia backs Nazi rehabilitation ban bill

5:01am April 5, 2014

Russian politicians have given initial approval to a bill forbidding "rehabilitation of Nazism" that will punish historians denying Nazi crimes during World War II but could also be used against the opposition. The bill introduces a new criminal charge for "denying facts" established by the Nuremberg tribunal regarding the crimes of the Axis powers, as well as "disseminating false information about Soviet actions" during the war. Punishment for such violations would range from a fine of 300,000 rubles (\$A9,230), up to prison terms of five years. The harshest punishments would be reserved for those who disseminate such views in the media or using public office, according to the text of the bill which went through a first reading on Friday.

Conservative pro-Kremlin MP Irina Yarovaya called rehabilitation of Nazism "not only a gunshot into the past and a crime against millions of victims of fascism, it is the execution of the future", because it could lead to the repetition of similar crimes.

Critics saw political motives behind the bill and said it could be used to enforce a single, Kremlin-approved interpretation of history. "It's directed against liberals and democrats that compare our regime with the regime of Hitler," political analyst Alexei Makarkin said.

A few Russian publications have recently run articles drawing parallels between Moscow's annexation of the Crimean peninsula with Adolf Hitler's moves to annex German-speaking regions. Respected professor Andrei Zubov was fired from his university, the Moscow State Institute of International Relations, in late March for comparing Russia's actions in Crimea to the Nazi's Anschluss with Austria in 1938 in a newspaper opinion piece.

<http://news.ninensn.com.au/world/2014/04/05/07/10/russia-backs-nazi-rehabilitation-ban-bill>

John Moriarty backs George Brandis on rights

PATRICIA KARVELAS, [THE AUSTRALIAN](#), APRIL 04, 2014 12:00AM

JOHN Moriarty has never been scared of a fight. The Aboriginal artist, activist and businessman, whose studio designed Qantas's distinctive plane livery, fought for Aboriginal rights in the 1967 referendum — and now he's standing up for freedom of speech.

He's backing moves by Attorney-General George Brandis to replace section 18C of the Racial Discrimination Act even if it allows some "nasty" things to be aired in public. He believes laws that prohibit speech are more hurtful than helpful to indigenous people.

"It's important to have forthright and firm discussions at all times," he told *The Australian*.

"This is where a good democratic society is so important to Australia. We had a lot of our fights way back in the 1960s leading up to the 67 referendum, and that gave us equality.

"The Constitution does not have anything that is detrimental for Aboriginal people. I believe that we should maintain free speech — some will bounce back in people's faces, but of course someone can be nasty, but some of it, if it is accurate and pertinent, I think we should hear it."

Section 18C makes it unlawful to offend, insult, humiliate or intimidate on the grounds of race, colour or ethnicity.

Under draft proposals, the government would replace 18C with provisions making it unlawful to vilify or intimidate others on similar grounds, but with broad exemptions.

Mr Moriarty said there should be "open discussions on Aboriginal issues both between black and white" and "among Aboriginal people as well".

"I think there is a lack of understanding of what our rights should be and how such discussions should be conducted. Once Aboriginal people know that this is about freedom of speech, I think they will be quite happy with it."

Senator Brandis yesterday defended his history of fighting racism in an article in *The Australian Jewish News*. "I have devoted much of my parliamentary career to defending Australia's multicultural society, and to opposing the strident, rebarbative voices of the far right wing, whether in the form of Pauline Hanson's One Nation party or some of the more extreme voices within my own party.

"I have adopted the Voltairean position that, if one is sincere in one's belief in freedom of speech, the true test is whether one will defend to the death the right of people to say things which one finds deeply offensive." He welcomed feedback about the 18C proposals.

"Where we want to end is by sending the strongest possible message that protecting people from racism, and protecting freedom of speech, are not inconsistent values. We can do both well, but only if Section 18C ... is reformed."

[HTTP://WWW.THEAUSTRALIAN.COM.AU/NATION
AL-AFFAIRS/POLICY/JOHN-MORIARTY-BACKS-
GEORGE-BRANDIS-ON-RIGHTS/STORY-
FN9HM1PM-1226874002785](http://www.theaustralian.com.au/nation/al-affairs/policy/john-moriarty-backs-george-brandis-on-rights/story-fn9hm1pm-1226874002785)

Palestinians stand before a situation faced by Christ: to bend to Jewish pressure or to break with Judaism's imposed worldview and create a new vision – Christianity. Adolf Hitler faced the same challenge when he wished to establish Germanism's National Socialism – and lost. – Fredrick Töben.

*

Palestinian students visit Auschwitz in first organized visit

Visit is part of program that aims to teach Israeli and Palestinian students about the other side's suffering in effort to study how empathy could facilitate reconciliation.

By [Matthew Kalman](#) | Mar. 28, 2014 | 12:24 AM |



The gate of the former German Nazi death camp of Auschwitz. Photo by AP

A group of 30 Palestinian students arrived at Auschwitz-Birkenau on Thursday, in what is believed to be the first organized visit by Palestinian students to a Nazi death camp.

The students are spending several days in Kraków and Oświęcim guided by two Jewish Holocaust survivors.

A news blackout on the trip was requested by the organizers. The presence of the Palestinian group at Auschwitz-Birkenau is being reported here for the first time.

The students from Al-Quds University are participating in a joint program on Reconciliation and Conflict Resolution with the Friedrich Schiller University in Jena, Germany, and Ben-Gurion University of the Negev.

The program's aim is for Israeli and Palestinian students to learn about the suffering that has helped shape the historical consciousness of the other side.

Last week, a group of Israeli students visited the Dheisheh refugee camp, located south of Bethlehem, to learn about the Palestinian experience of suffering during the founding of Israel in 1948 – known to Palestinians as the Nakba (“the catastrophe”).

The reactions of each group will be studied by a group of PhD psychology students to see whether exposure to the conflicting historical narrative helps the students to understand their enemy, and facilitates efforts toward reconciliation and coexistence.

The Palestinian side of the program is directed by Mohammed S. Dajani, professor of American Studies at Al-Quds. Because of the Palestinian freeze on joint projects with Israeli universities, the Palestinian students are participating under the banner of Prof. Dajani’s Wasatia movement of moderate Islam.

Israeli groups regularly visit refugee camps in the West Bank searching for cross-border understanding, but the Palestinian visit to Auschwitz is unprecedented. It grew out of a visit by Prof. Dajani as part of a large Jewish-Muslim-Christian delegation in 2011, after which he coauthored a New York Times op-ed entitled [“Why Palestinians Should Learn About the Holocaust.”](#)

Since then, Prof. Dajani has written what he believes to be the first objective introduction to the Holocaust for Palestinian students in Arabic, which he hopes will become a textbook used in Palestinian schools and universities.

“Basically, we want to study how empathy with the Other could help in the process of reconciliation,” Prof. Dajani says. “I feel I would like Palestinians to explore the unexplored, and to meet these challenges where you might find that within their community there will be a lot of pressure on them not to do it or questioning why they are doing it, or that this is propaganda. I feel that’s nonsense.”

Prof. Dajani says more than 70 students applied for the 30 places on the Poland trip, but five later dropped out because of peer pressure. He says the choice of Dheisheh for the Israeli students was not meant to suggest there was an equivalence or even a direct link between the Holocaust and the Nakba. They were chosen as the symbolic events that have deeply affected the psyche on both sides of the conflict.

“We are seeking knowledge,” he says. “We are seeking to know what has happened; why did it happen; how can it be

prevented from happening again? I believe it is very important to break this wall of bigotry, ignorance and racism that has separated us from crossing over to this new realm.”

“One of my students asked me why we should learn about the Holocaust when the Israelis want to ban even the use of the word ‘Nakba,’” he adds. “My response was: ‘Because in doing so, you will be doing the right thing. If they are not doing the right thing, that’s their problem.’”

Prof. Dajani, who was banned from Israel for 25 years for his activities for Fatah in Lebanon in the 1970s and ’80s, says the student program is a practical expression of his belief that Israelis and Palestinians can settle their differences through compromise, moderation and human contact. He says his own visit to the Nazi death camp had a profound effect that he wishes to share with his students.

“I was also raised in the culture of denial, so for me, to go and see and look and be on the ground – it was a very sad experience for me. It had a lot of impact,” he admits. “I was shocked about the inhumanity of man to man. How can this happen? Why did it happen? Why would man be this cruel?”

“It was shocking for me, because it showed me the deep, deep, dark side of human evil,” he adds.

Prof. Dajani has a track record of espousing views that are unpopular with the Palestinian academic mainstream. He is one of the few Palestinian professors to openly oppose the call for Palestinians and others to boycott Israeli universities.

Hanna Siniora, a veteran campaigner for Israeli-Palestinian reconciliation, says Prof. Dajani’s initiative should be welcomed.

“It’s very important for people to see the viciousness of such acts,” he says. “It should touch them in their humanity, in their sense of understanding that human beings don’t do evil things like that. This has caused a major problem in the Israeli-Palestinian conflict, because the psyche of the Israelis is so tormented by what happened to the Jewish people that they cannot trust anybody.”

“This is an educational trip. It opens the eyes and minds,” he adds. “If there is an empty place, I’d like to come along,” he says.

This article was amended on April 1, 2014, to reflect that fact that no students from Bir Zeit University took part in the visit.

<http://www.haaretz.com/news/national/1.582433>

From AI’s Archive

The New York Times

The Opinion Pages

I.H.T. OP-ED CONTRIBUTOR

Why Palestinians Should Learn About the Holocaust

By MOHAMMED DAJANI DAOUDI and ROBERT SATLOFF

Published: March 29, 2011

Should Palestinian and other Arab schools teach their students about the Holocaust?

This is not an academic question. Many Palestinian and Arab political organizations recently pounced on reports that a new human rights curriculum being prepared for use in Gaza schools operated by Unrwa, the United Nations aid agency for Palestinian refugees, might include historical references to the Holocaust. Their reaction underscores the urgency of answering this fundamental question: Should Palestinians (and

other Arabs) learn about the Holocaust? Should this historical tragedy be included in the Arab curriculum?

We — a Muslim-Palestinian social scientist, and a Jewish-American historian — believe the answer is yes. Indeed, there are many reasons why it’s important, even essential, that Arabs learn about the Holocaust. And much of this has nothing to do with Jews at all.

One of the sad realities of many modern Arab societies is that Arab students have been denied history, their own and the world’s. For decades, millions of Arabs have lived under

autocrats resentful of the legacy of the leader they replaced and fearful of the leader-to-come. Although Arabs revere the study, writing and teaching of history, and have produced many famous historians, their rulers often tend to view history as a threat. The result is that many historians in Arab countries are more like the court chroniclers of long-dead dynasties, and entire chapters of history have been expunged from the curricula that Arab governments teach their students. This is particularly true of the Holocaust. A world that has known terrible atrocities has seen none greater than the effort by Nazi Germany and its allies to exterminate the Jewish people. So methodical, so vicious and so exhaustive was the Nazi effort that a new word was coined to describe it — “genocide.” All genocides before and since are judged against the Holocaust. To the extent that we can prevent genocide in the future — an uphill task, given the record of the last few decades — understanding what gives rise to it is essential. Without discussing the Holocaust, discussing genocide is meaningless.

But Palestinians, and Arabs more generally, know little about the Holocaust and what they do know is often skewed by the perverted prism of Arab popular culture, from the ranting of religious extremists to the distortions of certain satellite television channels to the many ill-informed authors. What happened to the Jews during World War II is not taught in Arab schools or universities, either as part of world history or as a lesson in genocide awareness or as an atrocity that ought not to be repeated. Arabs have nothing to fear from opening their eyes to this chapter of human history. As the Koran says: “And say: My Lord, advance me in knowledge.” If Arabs knew more about the Holocaust in particular and genocide in general, perhaps Arab voices would be more forceful in trying to stop similar atrocities.

Palestinians have more specific reasons to learn about the Holocaust. We do not urge Holocaust education just so Palestinians can understand more sympathetically the legacy of Jewish suffering and its impact on the psyche of the Jewish people. While it is important for both Palestinians and Israelis to appreciate the historical legacies that have shaped their strategic outlook and national identities, teaching Palestinians about the Holocaust for this reason alone runs the risk the

feeding the facile equation that “the Jews have the Holocaust and the Palestinians have the Nakba.” We urge Palestinians to learn about the Holocaust so they can be armed with knowledge to reject the comparison because, if it were broadly avoided, peace would be even more attainable than it is today. With all the suffering Palestinians have endured, their struggle with Israel is still, at its core, a political conflict, one that can end through diplomacy and agreements. Today diplomacy is deadlocked, yet the nature of politics is that tomorrow that reality may change. The Holocaust was not a political conflict: the very idea of a “Nazi-Jewish peace process” is absurd. Teaching the Holocaust to Palestinians is a way to ensure they do not go down the blind alley of believing their peace process with Israel is as hopeless as one would have been between Nazis and Jews. Discussion of the Holocaust would underscore the idea that peace is attainable.

Almost two years ago millions of Muslim Arabs listened carefully when President Barack Obama, speaking in Cairo, respectfully recited sentences from the Koran and proclaimed America’s endorsement of a two-state solution to achieve a durable Israeli-Palestinian peace. Few, however, remember that he also condemned Holocaust denial. Now that the Arab masses are applying the universal lessons of democracy, human rights and the rule of law in taking down their authoritarian governments, it is time they take back the learning of history, too. That includes teaching their children the universal lessons of the Holocaust.

Mohammed S. Dajani Daoudi is the founder of the Wasatia movement, which promotes moderation in Islam, and the director of the American Studies department at Al-Quds University. **Robert Satloff** is executive director of the Washington Institute and the author of “Among the Righteous: Lost Stories from the Holocaust’s Long Reach into Arab Lands.”

http://www.nytimes.com/2011/03/30/opinion/30iht-edsatloff30.html?_r=2&

A version of this op-ed appeared in print on March 30, 2011, in The International Herald Tribune.

http://www.nytimes.com/2011/03/30/opinion/30iht-edsatloff30.html?_r=2&

[The Jews need Adolf Hitler but Adolf Hitler did not need the Jews! – ed. AI]

‘DNA shows Eva Braun may have had Jewish ancestry’

British TV show tests Hitler’s wife’s hair, finds Jewish sequence

in Aryan poster girl’s genetic material

By [Yifa Yaakov](#) April 5, 2014, 9:15 am



Adolf Hitler and Eva Braun walking their dogs, 1942.
(German Federal Archive)

Nazi leader Adolf Hitler’s girlfriend of 12 years and wife of 40 hours may have had Jewish ancestry, according to DNA testing performed on hairs from her toothbrush by a British TV show. The Channel 4 show *Dead Famous DNA*, which tests the genetic material of historical figures such as Elvis Presley, Charles Darwin, John F. Kennedy, Marilyn Monroe, and Napoleon, acquired the hairs from specialist dealer John

Reznikoff. They had come from a monogrammed brush found along with a matching mirror at Braun’s Bavarian apartment in 1945 by US Army intelligence officer Captain Paul Baer.

Baer’s son Alan said his father had kept the items in a duffel bag in the basement of the family’s home. After his death in the 1970s, his son sold the items to Reznikoff — who then sold them to *Dead Famous DNA* presenter Mark Evans for £1,200, or nearly \$2000.

After the hairs were acquired, a genetic analysis by a team of scientists on the show revealed that Braun, the Aryan poster girl, may have had Jewish ancestry on her mother’s side. Her genetic material was found to contain the haplogroup N1b1, associated with Ashkenazi Jewry. The haplogroup is passed on through the maternal line.

“This is a thought-provoking outcome — I never dreamt that I would find such a potentially extraordinary and profound result,” presenter Evans said of the findings.

Nevertheless, the conclusions are not definitive, as Braun’s two surviving female relatives refused to give DNA samples to confirm that the hairs were really Braun’s own.

Braun became Hitler’s lover in the early 1930s, while the latter’s Nazi power was gaining substantial influence in the German political arena. She married him in a small civil

ceremony in his Berlin bunker just after midnight on April 29, 1945. The two committed suicide the next day, on April 30 — two days before the city's defenders surrendered to the advancing Red Army. Hitler was 56 years old, and Braun was 33. They had been married for less than 40 hours. The episode concerning Braun will air in the UK Wednesday. In March, Channel 4 [came under fire](#) for buying a lock of hair allegedly belonging to Hitler from a convicted Holocaust-denying historian, only to discover that the relic was a fake. The TV station paid £3,000 (\$4,957) to David Irving, who is barred from entering Austria, Germany, Italy, and Canada for his writings on World War II that deny the atrocities perpetrated by the Third Reich.

News of the acquisition drew sharp condemnation from Labor MP Ian Austin, whose father's family perished in the Treblinka death camp. Austin referred to the buy as "sick," "tawdry," and "bizarre."

"It's disgusting, and raises questions about Channel 4's public broadcasting remit," he said, according to a report Sunday in Britain's Daily Mirror.

Upon scrutiny, the lock of hair, claimed to have been acquired from Hitler's barber who gathered it using sticky tape attached to the sole of his shoe, turned out to be inauthentic.

Marissa Newman contributed to this report

<http://www.timesofisrael.com/dna-shows-eva-braun-may-have-had-jewish-ancestry/>

Jewish traveler cheats death by forgoing Malaysia flight on Shabbat Says he flew a day early on observant agent's advice.

By [The Forward](#) and Hody Nemes | Mar. 12, 2014 | 1:47 PM | 10

The owner of a travel site claims a Jewish air traveler cheated death when he decided not to fly on Shabbat — and avoided being on board doomed Malaysia Airlines Flight 370.

The lucky globetrotter changed his mind about booking the flight last Saturday after an observant travel agent refused to book the flight from Kuala Lumpur to Beijing, [according to Daniel Eleff](#), a friend of the travel agent and CEO of the Cleveland-based travel site Dansdeals.com.

"Holy God, You sure[ly] heard what happened to [Malaysian Airlines flight 370]," the traveler, who only identified himself by his first name of Andy, wrote to the travel agent in an email. "I cannot stop thinking about this. This is a true miracle for the books. You are a true life saver."

"I am so happy for you!" the agent responded. But he saw a larger plan at work in Andy's close brush with death. "Not I am the life saver. God and Shabbat were your life savers. You owe them something," he wrote.

The Malaysia Airlines flight disappeared without a trace about an hour after taking off from Kuala Lumpur. Authorities are still searching for the plane or its wreckage — and seeking an explanation for what they assume was its crash.

The flight-switch drama unfolded when Andy asked his travel agent to book a flight on March 8. But the agent, who is an Orthodox Jew, said he did not want another Jew traveling on Shabbat.

"I wish I can give you a day later, but you know I just don't like flying Jews on Shabbat," he wrote in a January 14 email to Andy, one of several emails between the two men which were posted on a blog on Dansdeals.com.

Andy told the agent not to hold the Friday morning flight — he decided to book a flight on Shabbat independently.

"I guess I'll just book [the Saturday flight] myself," Andy told the agent, but asked him to book the rest of his itinerary, which included flights to Vietnam, Hong Kong, and Melbourne, Australia.

Later that evening, Andy changed his mind and decided not to fly on Shabbat after all. He thanked the agent for prompting him to consider the obligation not to travel on the holy day.

"I reconsidered, you are right and I should be more observant," Andy wrote the agent. "I'll manage without that day in Kuala [Lumpur]."

The travel agent booked the Friday flight, and both men put the matter aside. On March 7, Andy successfully flew on Malaysia Airlines flight 370 from Kuala Lumpur to Beijing. Exactly 24 hours later, the same flight ended in tragedy, resulting in the presumed deaths of the 239 people onboard.

After Shabbat ended on March 8, the travel agent turned on his computer and read the grateful email.

The story of Andy's near-miss was posted online by Daniel Eleff, a friend of the travel agent and CEO of the travel site Dansdeals.com. Eleff provided several redacted emails, with identifying information removed.

"At this time the travel agent and the passenger are opting to remain anonymous," he told the Forward in an email. "They are choosing to wait until the fate of the flight is known to determine if they'll go public."

Contact Hody Nemes on Twitter @hodify or at nemes@forward.com

<http://www.haaretz.com/jewish-world/jewish-world-news/1.579373>

Ukraine: Neo-Nazi Criminal State Looming

By [Oriental Review](#), Global Research, February 24, 2014

"There are many who do not know they are fascists but will find it out when the time comes."

Ernest Hemingway, For Whom the Bell Tolls

After signing a void [agreement](#) on "crisis settlement" on Friday, the situation in Ukraine has rapidly got out of control of its signatories and "witnesses". No provisions of this document were fulfilled. The legitimate authorities fled (or tried to flee) the country, the [governmental buildings in Kiev are taken](#) by the revolutionary mob. The radicals are dictating the new rules to façade opposition "leaders" [who desperately try to bridle theMaidan](#).

What happened to Ukraine on February 21, 2014 is essentially a criminal coup committed by the radical armed anarchists and Ukrainian Nazis who have been enjoying a comprehensive financial, military, diplomatic and even religious support and instigation from the Western power groups for the last two decades. Many of Ukraine's cities are now falling into the chaos of lootings, unprovoked violence, lynch law and political repressions. The first signs of upcoming chaos were clearly seen as the Ukrainian authorities wavered at the three-month siege of the centre of Kiev by the radical guerrilla elements

from Galicia and local criminal gangs. They watched silently when furious fanatics were [burning unarmed riot police Berkut officers alive, lynching them](#) and [pulling out their eyes](#). They did nothing to stop frantic "freedom fighters" from [storming regional administrations, humiliating the officials](#) and [looting police and military arsenals](#) in the West Ukraine. They were paralyzed when unidentified snipers were cool-bloodily [killing militia personnel, protesters and casual passer-bys](#) from the roofs of Kiev's buildings. They even declared amnesty (twice!) to those guilty of the brutal crimes against policemen and public order. Thus Yanukovich's regime itself paved the way for a sinister ghost of the war-torn Libya to come to Ukraine.

Is the guerrilla side a self-organized and self-indoctrinated popular movement tired of a corrupt and inefficient state? That is hardly the case.

Since the collapse of the Soviet Union the international power groups have invested billions of the Federal Reserve notes (aka US\$) into Ukrainian "pro-democratic" NGOs and politicians.

While preaching "Ukrainian commitment to the European choice and democratic values" in the meantime they clearly

saw that there is no short-term historical perspective for making Ukraine a state hostile to Russia, which is evidently the final goal of the globalist Eastern policy.



The stakes were placed on the ultranationalist elements in the Western Ukraine and in the [Uniate Church](#), a minority religious Greek-Catholic community of the Eastern rite, [created](#) by the Holy See in XVI century in a desperate attempt to weaken close ties of [Rzeczpospolita's](#) Orthodox with Moscow. Since the early 1990s the Uniates enjoyed silent support of the newly-independent central authorities in Kiev. Their tactic was to aggressively occupy Orthodox cathedrals on the canonic territory of the [Moscow Patriarchate](#). The last thing the Uniate clergy used to preach in the occupied churches for all these years was the Christian call for repentance and peace. Instead they propagated a new crusade against the Orthodox and directly instigated and justified race-motivated prosecutions and even killings, acting exactly like radical jihadist preachers of the militant pseudo-Islamic sects. Suffice to watch a "Sunday sermon" by Mykhailo Arsenych, the clergyman from a local Uniate church in Ivano-Frankovsk region, Ukraine saying: "Today we are really ready for a revolution. The only effective methods of combat are assassination and terror! We want to be sure that no Chinese, Negro, Jew or Muscovite will try to come and grab our land tomorrow!"

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=C5EXdbzIDEk>

The products of such indoctrination were not long in coming. A number of NATO-sponsored training centers for the Ukrainian ultranationalist militants were opened on the territory of the Baltic states immediately after they joined NATO in 2004. The detailed photo report on a Ukrainian group taking a course of subversive activities at a NATO training center in Estonia in 2006 is available [here](#) (texts in Russian).

Abundant financial and human resources were directed to bolster the paramilitary units of the radical [UNA-UNSO](#), [Svoboda](#) and other ultranationalist organizations in the Ukraine. Since 1990s these thugs were participating in the Chechen and Balkan wars on the side of radical Wahhabi (!) militants and committing war crimes against captured Russian and Serbian soldiers and civilian population. One of the notorious guerilla fighters of the Ukrainian origin in Chechnya, **Olexander Muzychko** (aka criminal leader Sasha Biliy) today is heading a brigade of "[Pravyi Sector](#)", the radical militant driving force of the ongoing coup d'état in Kiev. According to his "official" biography ([link](#) in Russian), in 1994 he was awarded by the then top commander of terrorist [Ichkeria](#) enclave [Dzhohar Dudayev](#) with the order "Hero of Nation" for "outstanding military successes against Russian troops". His "military skills" were quite specific: he used to lure the Russian units operating in remote Chechen locations to guerilla ambushes. Then he personally participated in tortures and beheadings of the captured Russian soldiers.

After returning to the Ukraine in 1995, he led a criminal gang in Rovno. Eventually he was prosecuted and sentences for 8 years term for kidnapping for ransom and attempted assassination of a Ukrainian businessman. He entered politics after release from prison in late 2000s.



Olexander Muzychko today in Kiev, left, and in Chechnya in 1994.

After the end of Chechen and Balkan wars the British and American private military contractors were routinely recruiting Ukrainian mercenaries for operations in Afghanistan, Iraq, Syria and elsewhere. [The Britam Defense scandal](#) revealed the way and scale of how the Ukrainian personnel of the private military contractors were used in provocative clandestine actions to meet Western political goals in the Middle East. Many of them were sent to Kiev to make the job they are paid for – to target both policemen and protesters on "Euromaidan" from the roofs of surrounding buildings.

The real leaders of the protest have already clearly expressed their radical views to the European press (read e.g. the [interview](#) with the Pravyi Sector leader Dmitro Yarosh and several recent Guardian's publications [here](#) and [here](#)).

That is the sort of people the half-hearted European politicians are about to deal with in the Ukraine. These fanatics are the real authority in today's Kiev seized by the marauding mobs. They have torn the Friday's agreement [signed](#) by four Ukrainian "leaders" and three European officials before the ink was dry on this paper. Their treatment of Yulia Timoshenko after her emotional [speech](#) on the Maidan Saturday night has clearly shown that her nomination de facto head of failing Ukrainian state would be their decision. Latest Western [advice](#) to financially support Ukraine with the IMF and the EU funds suggest that they have chosen to buy the loyalty of the ultranationalists for the transition period. Therefore, the ongoing Western policy of appeasement towards the radical insurgents in Kiev very much resembles [the Anglo-American connivance](#) in Hitler's accession to power in Germany in 1933 and the rise of the Third Reich. But if the Western elitist groups suppose that the Neo-Nazi project that they have carefully cherished and supported in Ukraine for decades, would be controlled by political means and set against Russia, they are deadly wrong. After facing [furious resistance](#) and blowback at the East and South of the Ukraine, the radical Nazi ideological avalanche encouraged by the illusion of success in Kiev would inevitably enter the degrading European political landscape where the neo-Nazi and hooligan outbreaks are already a [notable destabilizing factor](#). Their established links with the Islamist underground in Europe add another sinister dimension to the murky European future.

Is it the price the Europeans are ready to pay for bringing its eastern neighbors into the "family of civilized nations"?

<http://www.globalresearch.ca/ukraine-neo-nazi-criminal-state-looming/5370436>

The hellish monotony of 25 years of IPCC climate change warnings

The latest blockbuster United Nations report on the impacts of climate change makes dire reading, just as the first one did almost a quarter of a century ago



[Graham Readfearn](#) Monday 31 March 2014 11.22 EST

Entire island nations "rendered uninhabitable", millions of people to be displaced by floods and rising seas, uncertainties over global food supplies and severe impacts on human health across the world.

The news from the United Nations on the likely impacts of [climate change](#) is dire, especially for the poorest people on the planet. There will likely be more floods, more droughts and more intense heatwaves, says the UN's [Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change](#).

As human emissions of greenhouse gases continue to rise, natural ecosystems come under extreme stress with "significant" knock-on effects for societies.

"Changes in the availability of food, fuel, medicine, construction materials and income are possible as these ecosystems are changed," says the report.

But in the words of that great British band The Smiths, you can now [stop me if you think you've heard this one before](#).

That's because all of the above comes not from [today's blockbuster IPCC report on the impacts of climate change](#), but from the first one started in 1988 and published in 1990. Much of the science it drew on was older still.

Just so we can calibrate our memories here, 1990 was the year Tim Berners-Lee invented the world wide web, Nelson Mandela got out of jail and MC Hammer wore those pantaloons ([U Can't Touch This](#)).

Now more than 25 years after scientists started compiling that first report, the latest report is similarly alarming - just with added impacts and greater certainty.

As [The Guardian reports](#), the IPCC now says climate change is already cutting into food supplies and has the ability to fuel conflict. So for the sheer hellish monotony of it all, let's go through a quarter of a century of warnings from the IPCC about the impacts of human-caused climate change.

First Assessment Report – 1990

After 18 months work, the chairman of the IPCC working group looking at the impacts of climate change wrote the issue was "potentially the greatest global environmental challenge facing humankind".

That [first report](#) was based on findings that if CO2 levels in the atmosphere were to double, this would deliver a global temperature rise of between 1.5C and 5C, with sea levels rising by about one metre by the end of the 21st century. The world's polar regions would warm at double the rate.

Natural ecosystems would face "significant consequences" from climate change. "Major health impacts" were possible because of changes to the availability of water and food and from heat stress and increased spread of disease. Poorer countries were the most vulnerable.



The opening session of IPCC meeting in Yokohama. Photograph: Yoshikazu Tsuno/AFP/Getty Images

The working group thought then that some of the greatest impacts for developed countries "may be determined by policy responses" such as regulations on fuel and "emission fees".

The report also warned: "Global warming will accelerate sea-level rise, modify ocean circulation and change marine ecosystems with considerable socioeconomic circumstances".

One major uncertainty was the risk climate change might pose to food supplies.

The report said that "on balance" global food production could be maintained at the same level, even if the costs of doing that remained "unclear".

Second Assessment Report – 1995

Some of the world's ecological systems could take centuries to "reach a new equilibrium", warned the IPCC's second major

assessment report (SAR) into the impacts of climate change, building on the report from five years earlier.

Coastal systems are at risk, said the SAR, having "major negative effects on tourism, freshwater supplies, fisheries, and biodiversity".

One third to a half of the mass of mountain glaciers could disappear within 100 years.

In the oceans, SAR concluded that sea levels would rise, ocean circulation could be altered and the amount of sea ice would drop.

Serious concerns were raised about water supplies for everything from power generation to domestic supplies.

The panel was still uncertain about the affects of climate change on food supplies, but there were concerns the risk of hunger and famine could increase among the world's poorest.

"Climate change is likely to have wide-ranging and mostly adverse impacts on human health, with significant loss of life," said the report.

Exposure to extreme weather events could raise the risk of increased "death, injury [and] psychological disorders".

In other news, a company called eBay is created, former American Football hero O.J Simpson is found not guilty of double murder and Forrest Gump wins the Oscar for best picture.

Third Assessment Report – 2001

Projected climate changes during the 21st century have the potential to lead to future large-scale and possibly irreversible changes in Earth systems resulting in impacts at continental and global scales.

So goes the third major IPCC report into the impacts of climate change, which repeats previous warnings and then adds lots more.

Most sub-tropical and tropical areas will see a fall in crop yields as temperatures go up. In mid latitudes, yields might improve if temperature rises are only low, says the report.

Urban populations are likely to be impacted by rises in temperature extremes "affecting particularly the elderly, sick, and those without access to air-conditioning".

In some temperate countries, the number of people dying in the winter from cold could outnumber the increased summer deaths, but the evidence for this is limited.

In other news, the world gets Wikipedia, iPods and lots of people go and watch movies about bespectacled young wizards and hobbits.

Assessment Report Four – 2007

It's "all of the above", again, with the release of the fourth assessment report (AR4) in 2007.

"Many millions more people are projected to be flooded every year due to sea-level rise by the 2080s," the report says.

If global average temperatures rise between 1.5C and 2.5C, then "approximately 20 to 30 per cent of plant and animal species assessed so far are likely to be at increased risk of extinction".

The message on global food production is still mixed, but the panel concludes that if temperatures get above a range of between one and 3C, then food production drops.

For the fourth time, the report is clear that poorer communities are the most vulnerable with small island nations "especially vulnerable".

Climate change will "affect the health status of millions of people" with increases in malnutrition and impacts for child development. Heatwaves, floods, storms, fires and droughts will increase deaths and injury.

The IPCC still says that in some temperate countries there might be fewer deaths from cold exposure, but overall, the report says, "it is expected that these benefits will be outweighed by the negative health effects of rising temperatures worldwide, especially in developing countries".

For Africa, the year 2020 will see between 75 and 250 million people "exposed to increased water stress due to climate change".

The Asian mega deltas are warned again about the increased risk of flooding from storm surges and sea level rise.

In Australia and New Zealand, some ecologically rich sites including the Great Barrier Reef, the Queensland Wet Tropics, the Kakadu wetlands, sub-Antarctic islands and alpine areas are deemed to be at risk of significant biodiversity loss. Some of these areas will see impacts as early as 2020. Increased drought and fire will cut production in agriculture and forestry by 2030 over much of southern and eastern Australia, and over parts of eastern New Zealand. Negative impacts for Europe will include "increased risk of inland flash floods, and more frequent coastal flooding and increased erosion". If emissions remain high, then parts of Europe will see 60 per cent of all species will be gone by the year 2080. Latin America is warned some of its most important crops and livestock will be impacted "with adverse consequences for food security".

In other news, mortgage defaults in the US spark a global credit crunch, people queue for a seventh book about a teenage wizard and bands perform at Live Earth climate change concerts around the world. Assessment Report Five - 2014
You can find the latest cheerful [IPCC report here](#). More than 300 authors and editors from 70 countries put it together, with more than 400 contributors and over 50,000 comments. But if we go back to [brass tacks](#), it's worth asking how the world has reacted to these repeated warnings. Since 1990, [annual global greenhouse gas emissions from burning fossil fuels](#) have gone up 60 per cent. As The Smiths also said, [That joke isn't funny any more](#). <http://www.theguardian.com/environment/planetoz/2014/mar/31/ipcc-climate-change-impacts-report-history-warnings>

Does this make sense?

Circumcision protects heterosexual men from HIV? – just asking!

Study recommends circumcision, to avoid diseases

While practice is under attack in parts of Europe as abusive, American-Australian research team compares it to vaccination

By [JTA](#) April 4, 2014, 7:14 pm [1](#)

In August 2012, the American Academy of Pediatrics published a study suggesting that the procedure may protect heterosexual men from HIV and that the health benefits outweighed the risks connected to the procedure.

An Australian-American team of researchers recommended circumcising infant males to avoid diseases in a new study that compared the practice to vaccination.

The team, led by Brian Morris of the School of Medical Sciences at the University of Sydney, asserted in its newly published study that half of uncircumcised males will contract an adverse medical condition caused by their foreskin.

"As with vaccination, circumcision of newborn boys should be part of public health policies," the three coauthors wrote in their study, whose main findings were published on Wednesday on the medical website mayoclinicproceedings.org. In the United States, circumcision rates in men has increased to 81 percent over the past decade, the study said.

Morris and the study's co-authors, Stefan A. Bailis of the University of Sydney and Thomas E. Wiswell, a neonatologist from Florida, nonetheless wrote that a critical analysis of hospital discharge data in the United States showed that circumcision of infant males was in decline in that country.

According to the study, the practice has declined from 83 percent in the 1960s to 77 percent by 2010, largely due to the

increase in the Hispanic population, where the practice is less prevalent.

"A risk-benefit analysis of conditions that neonatal circumcision protects against revealed that benefits exceed risks by at least 100 to one," the authors wrote in the study, titled: "Circumcision Rates in the United States: Rising or Falling? What Effect Might the New Affirmative Pediatric Policy Statement Have?"

In August 2012, the American Academy of Pediatrics published a study suggesting that the procedure may protect heterosexual men from HIV and that the health benefits outweighed the risks connected to the procedure.

In response, dozens of European physicians — mostly from Scandinavia — wrote a letter alleging that "cultural bias" was behind the academy's pro-circumcision stance.

Ritual circumcision of boys under 18 has come under attack in northern Europe in recent years, with several political parties and medical associations, mainly in Scandinavia, decrying it as a form of child abuse.

<http://www.timesofisrael.com/study-recommends-circumcision-to-avoid-diseases/>

Brian Mattson:

The Secret Gnostic Key to Aronofsky's "Noah" that Everyone Missed All those bizarre additions to the story make a lot more sense now...

In Darren Aronofsky's new star-gilt silver screen epic, *Noah*, Adam and Eve are luminescent and fleshless, right up until the moment they eat the forbidden fruit.

Such a notion isn't found in the Bible, of course. This, among the multitude of Aronofsky's other imaginative details like giant Lava Monsters, has caused many a reviewer's head to be scratched. Conservative-minded evangelicals write off the film because of the "liberties" taken with the text of Genesis, while a more liberal-minded group stands in favor of cutting the director some slack. After all, we shouldn't expect a professed atheist to have the same ideas of "respecting" sacred texts the way a Bible-believer would. Both groups have missed the mark entirely. Aronofsky hasn't "taken liberties" with anything. *The Bible is not his text*.

In his defense, I suppose, the film wasn't advertised as such. Nowhere is it said that this movie is an adaptation of Genesis.

It was never advertised as "*The Bible's Noah*," or "*The Biblical Story of Noah*." In our day and age we are so living in the leftover atmosphere of Christendom that when somebody says they want to do "Noah," everybody *assumes* they mean a rendition of the *Bible* story. That isn't what Aronofsky had in mind at all. I'm sure he was only too happy to let his studio go right on assuming that, since if they knew what he was really up to they never would have allowed him to make the movie.

Let's go back to our luminescent first parents. I recognized the motif instantly as one common to the ancient religion of Gnosticism. Here's a 2nd century A.D. description about what a sect called the Ophites believed:

"Adam and Eve formerly had light, luminous, and so to speak spiritual bodies, as they had been fashioned. But when they came here, the bodies became dark, fat, and idle." —Irenaeus of Lyon, *Against Heresies*, I, 30.9

It occurred to me that a mystical tradition more closely related to Judaism, called *Kabbalah* (which the singer Madonna made popular a decade ago or so), surely would have held a similar view, since it is essentially a form of *Jewish Gnosticism*. I dusted off (No, really: I had to dust it) my copy of Adolphe Franck's 19th century work, *The Kabbalah*, and quickly confirmed my suspicions: "Before they were beguiled by the subtleness of the serpent, Adam and Eve were not only exempt from the need of a body, but did not even have a body—that is to say, they were not of the earth."

Franck quotes from the *Zohar*, one of *Kabbalah's* sacred texts: "When our forefather Adam inhabited the Garden of Eden, he was clothed, as all are in heaven, with a garment made of the higher light. When he was driven from the Garden of Eden and was compelled to submit to the needs of this world, what happened? God, the Scriptures tell us, made Adam and his wife tunics of skin and clothed them; for before this they had tunics of light, of that higher light used in Eden..."

Obscure stuff, I know. But curiosity overtook me and I dove right down the rabbit hole.

I discovered what Darren Aronofsky's first feature film was: *Pi*. Want to know its subject matter? Do you? Are you sure?

Kabbalah

If you think that's a coincidence, you may want a loved one to schedule you a brain scan.

Have I got your attention? Good.

The world of Aronofsky's *Noah* is a thoroughly Gnostic one: a graded universe of "higher" and "lower." The "spiritual" is good, and way, way, way "up there" where the ineffable, *unspeaking* god dwells, and the "material" is bad, and way, way down here where our spirits are encased in material flesh. This is not only true of the fallen sons and daughters of Adam and Eve, but of fallen angels, who are explicitly depicted as being spirits *trapped* inside a material "body" of cooled molten lava.

Admittedly, they make pretty nifty movie characters, but they're also notorious in Gnostic speculation. Gnostics call them *Archons*, lesser divine beings or angels who aid "The Creator" in forming the visible universe. And *Kabbalah* has a pantheon of angelic beings of its own all up and down the ladder of "divine being." And fallen angels are never totally fallen in this brand of mysticism. To quote the *Zohar* again, a central *Kabbalah* text: "All things of which this world consists, the spirit as well as the body, will return to the principle and the root from which they came." Funny. That's exactly what happens to Aronofsky's Lava Monsters. They redeem themselves, shed their outer material skin, and fly back to the heavens. Incidentally, I noticed that in the film, as the family is traveling through a desolate wasteland, Shem asks his father: "Is this a *Zohar* mine?" Yep. That's the name of *Kabbalah's* sacred text.

The entire movie is, figuratively, a "Zohar" mine.

If there was any doubt about these "Watchers," Aronofsky gives several of them names: Semyaza, Magog, and Rameel. They're all well-known demons in the Jewish mystical tradition, not only in *Kabbalah* but also in the book of *1 Enoch*. What!? *Demons* are redeemed? Adolphe Franck explains the cosmology of *Kabbalah*: "Nothing is absolutely bad; nothing is accursed forever—not even the archangel of evil or the venomous beast, as he is sometimes called. There will come a time when he will recover his name and his angelic nature."

Okay. That's weird. But, hey, everybody in the film seems to worship "The Creator," right? Surely it's got that in its favor!

Except that when Gnostics speak about "The Creator" they are *not talking about God*. Oh, here in an affluent world living off the fruits of Christendom the term "Creator" generally denotes the true and living God. But here's a little "Gnosticism 101" for you: the *Creator of the material world* is an ignorant, arrogant, jealous, exclusive, violent, low-level, bastard son of a low level deity. He's responsible for creating the "unspiritual" world of flesh and matter, and he himself is so ignorant of the spiritual world he fancies himself the "only God" and demands absolute obedience. They generally call him "Yahweh." Or other names, too (Ialdabaoth, for example).

This Creator tries to keep Adam and Eve from the true knowledge of the divine and, when they disobey, flies into a rage and boots them from the garden.

In other words, in case you're losing the plot here: *The serpent was right all along*. This "god," "The Creator," whom they are worshiping is *withholding* something from them that the serpent will provide: divinity itself.

The world of Gnostic mysticism is bewildering with a myriad of varieties. But, generally speaking, they hold in common that the *serpent* is "Sophia," "Mother," or "Wisdom."

The *serpent* represents the *true* divine, and the claims of "The Creator" are false.

So is the serpent a major character in the film?

Let's go back to the movie. The action opens when Lamech is about to bless his son, Noah. Lamech, rather strangely for a patriarch of a family that follows God, takes out a sacred relic, *the skin of the serpent from the Garden of Eden*. He wraps it around his arm, stretches out his hand to touch his son—except, just then, a band of marauders interrupts them and the ceremony isn't completed. Lamech gets killed, and the "villain" of the film, Tubal-Cain, steals the snakeskin. Noah, in other words, doesn't get whatever benefit the serpent's skin was to bestow.

The skin doesn't light up magically on Tubal-Cain's arm, so apparently he doesn't get "enlightened," either. And that's why everybody in the film, including protagonist and antagonist, Noah and Tubal-Cain, is worshiping "The Creator." *They are all deluded*. Let me clear something up here: lots of reviewers expressed some bewilderment over the fact there aren't any likable characters and that they *all* seem to be worshiping the same God. Tubal-Cain and his clan are wicked and evil and, as it turns out, Noah's pretty bad himself when he abandons Ham's girlfriend and almost slays two newborn children. Some thought this was some kind of profound commentary on how there's evil in all of us. Here's an excerpt from the *Zohar*, the sacred text of *Kabbalah*: "Two beings [Adam and Nachash—the Serpent] had intercourse with Eve [the Second woman], and she conceived from both and bore two children. Each followed one of the male parents, and their spirits parted, one to this side and one to the other, and similarly their characters. On the side of Cain are all the haunts of the evil species; from the side of Abel comes a more merciful class, yet not wholly beneficial -- good wine mixed with bad."

Sound familiar? Yes. Darren Aronofsky's *Noah*, to the "T." Anyway, everybody is worshiping the *evil* deity. Who wants to destroy *everybody*. (By the way, in *Kabbalah* many worlds have already been created and destroyed.) Both Tubal-Cain and Noah have identical scenes, looking into the heavens and asking, "Why won't you *speak to me*?" "The Creator" has abandoned them all because he intends to kill them all.

Noah had been given a vision of the coming deluge. He's drowning, but sees animals floating to the surface to the safety of the ark. No indication whatsoever is given that Noah is to be saved; Noah conspicuously makes that part up during an awkward moment explaining things to his family. He is sinking while the animals, "the innocent," are rising. "The Creator" who gives Noah his vision wants *all the humans dead*. Many reviewers thought Noah's change into a homicidal maniac on the ark, wanting to kill his son's two newborn daughters, was a weird plot twist. It isn't weird at all. In the Director's view, Noah is worshiping a *false, homicidal maniac* of a god. The more faithful and "godly" Noah becomes, the more *homicidal* he becomes. He is becoming every bit the "image of god" that the "evil" guy who keeps talking about the "image of god," Tubal-Cain, is.

But Noah fails "The Creator." He cannot wipe out all life like his god wants him to do. "When I looked at those two girls, my heart was filled with nothing but *love*," he says. Noah now has something "The Creator" doesn't. Love. And Mercy. But where did he get it? And why now?

In the immediately preceding scene Noah killed Tubal-Cain and *recovered the snakeskin relic*: "Sophia," "Wisdom," the true light of the divine. Just a coincidence, I'm sure.

Okay, I'm almost done. The rainbows don't come at the end because God makes a covenant with Noah. The rainbows appear when Noah sobers up and *embraces the serpent*. He wraps the skin around his arm, and blesses his family. It is not *God* that commissions them to now multiply and fill the earth, but Noah, in the first person, "I," wearing the serpent talisman. (Oh, and by the way, it's not accidental that the rainbows are all *circular*. The circle of the "One," the *Ein Sof*, in *Kabbalah*, is the sign of monism.)

Notice this thematic change: Noah was in a drunken stupor the scene before. Now he is sober and "enlightened." Filmmakers *never* do that by accident.

He's transcended and outgrown that homicidal, jealous deity. Let me issue a couple of caveats to all this: Gnostic speculation is a diverse thing. Some groups appear *radically* "dualist," where "The Creator" really is a different "god" altogether. Others are more "monist," where God exists in a series of descending emanations. Others have it that the lower deity "grows" and "matures" and himself ascends the "ladder" or "chain" of being to higher heights. *Noah* probably fits a little in each category. It's hard to tell. My other caveat is this: there is no doubt a *ton* of *Kabbalist* imagery, quotations, and themes in this movie that I couldn't pick up in a single sitting. For example, since *Kabbalah* takes its flights of fancy generally based on Hebrew letters and numbers, I did notice that the "Watchers" appeared to be deliberately shaped like Hebrew letters. But you could not pay me to go see this movie again so I could further drill into the *Zohar* mine to see what I could find. (On a purely cinematic viewpoint, I found most of it unbearably boring.)

What I can say on one viewing is this:

Darren Aronofsky has produced a retelling of the Noah story without reference to the Bible at all. This was not, as he claimed, just a storied tradition of run-of-the-mill Jewish "Midrash." This was a thoroughly pagan retelling of the Noah story direct from *Kabbalist* and Gnostic sources. To my mind, there is simply no doubt about this. So let me tell you what the real scandal in all of this is. It isn't that he made a film that departed from the biblical story. It isn't that disappointed and overheated Christian critics had expectations set too high. The scandal is this: of all the Christian leaders who went to great lengths to endorse this movie (for whatever reasons: "it's a conversation starter," "at least Hollywood is doing

something on the Bible," etc.), and all of the Christian leaders who panned it for "not following the Bible"...

Not one of them could identify a blatantly Gnostic subversion of the biblical story when it was right in front of their faces.

I believe Aronofsky did it as an experiment to make fools of us: "You are so ignorant that I can put Noah (granted, it's *Russell Crowe*!) up on the big screen and portray him literally as the 'seed of the Serpent' and you all will watch my studio's screening and endorse it."

He's having quite the laugh. And shame on everyone who bought it. And *what a Gnostic experiment!* In Gnosticism, only the "elite" are "in the know" and have the secret knowledge. Everybody else are dupes and ignorant fools. The "event" of this movie is intended to illustrate the Gnostic premise. We are dupes and fools. Would Christendom awake, please?

In response, I have one simple suggestion:

Henceforth, not a single seminary degree is granted unless the student demonstrates that he has read, digested, and understood Irenaeus of Lyon's *Against Heresies*. Because it's the 2nd century all over again.

Postscript

Some readers may think I'm being hard on people for not noticing the Gnosticism at the heart of this film. I am not expecting rank-and-file viewers to notice these things. I would expect exactly what we've seen: head-scratching confusion. I've got a whole different standard for Christian *leaders*: college and seminary professors, pastors, and Ph.Ds. If a serpent skin wrapped around the arm of a godly Bible character doesn't set off any alarms... I don't know what to say.

Editor's Note: Responses

[Peter T. Chattaway](#) and [Ryan Holt](#) acknowledge there are elements of *Kabbalah* in the movie, but think his theory doesn't explain the whole movie. Brian Mattson responds to his critics [here](#).

Brian Mattson, Ph.D. (University of Aberdeen) is a theologian, writer, speaker, and host of [Dead Reckoning.TV](#). He serves as Senior Scholar of Public Theology for the Center For Cultural Leadership, and lives in Billings, Montana.

<http://www.aleteia.org/en/artsentertainment/aggregatedcontent/theseecretgnostickeytoaronofskysnoahthateveryonemissed5237320601042944>

Anti-Zionists Must Not Be Allowed to Hijack the Jewish Community

[Jonathan S. Tobin](#) | [@tobincommentary](#) 02.21.2014 - 2:31 PM

This week the Jewish world is discussing two incidents in which large community institutions were forced to account for invitations to prominent writers who are virulent foes of Israel. In one case New York's Jewish Museum [was under fire](#) for inviting academic Judith Butler. In another, the Museum of Jewish Heritage, also in New York, [canceled an appearance](#) by *New Republic* editor John Judis. What both these figures had in common was their bitter opposition to Israel. In Butler's case, she is a prominent supporter of the BDS (boycott, divest, sanction) movement that seeks to wage economic war on the State of Israel. Judis is the author of [a book](#) that questions the legitimacy of Israel's creation in a revisionist history of President Harry Truman's role in the creation of the Jewish state, as historian Ron Radosh [pointed out in the Jerusalem Post](#).

Taken together, along with other incidents in the last year involving other BDS supporters being invited to Manhattan's 92nd Street Y, the decision by the two museums to let outraged members and donors derail the events is seen as a sign of a wave of repression in the American Jewish community. Sounding a theme that has become a constant refrain on the left, supporters of Israel are being accused of cracking down on dissent. But the issue here isn't free speech or even whether Israel's policies should be debated. It's

whether an extremist anti-Zionist minority will be able to hijack Jewish institutions.

The accusation about free speech is a canard. Butler, Judis, and other BDS supporters, such as rocker Roger Waters and writer Alice Walker (who were both invited to the 92nd Street Y last year), do not lack forums to promote their anti-Israel views. Judis admitted as much in an article in the *Forward* about the controversy. He noted that far from being repressed, Israel's critics were finding it easier than ever to find forums where they are heard. As is the case with Hillel branches at college campuses around the country that are declaring their willingness to host BDS backers or sponsor programs with anti-Israel groups, anti-Zionists aren't being silenced. Moreover, the talk about suppression of dissent against Israel rarely takes into account the fact that the mainstream liberal media gives these anti-Zionists equal time on their op-ed pages as well as occasional puffy features where they are portrayed as valiant dissenters even [as they are being lionized](#) by newspapers like the *New York Times*.

The *Times* can publish what it likes, but institutions that are supported and funded by a broad consensus of the Jewish community are accountable to their donors and the Jewish public. The notion that they should give platforms to individuals who are part of a campaign to delegitimize Zionism and the State of Israel is one that strikes most of those donors

as indefensible. They believe their funds should not be used to subsidize programs or promote individuals or produce plays whose purpose is to lend weight to the voices seeking Israel's destruction.

Those who claim that BDS and anti-Zionism are just another legitimate point of view that deserves a public airing and debate are hypocrites. The BDS cause is one based in a prejudiced view that holds that the Jews are the one people on the planet that are neither entitled to their own homeland or to defend it. Such bias if applied to other groups would be seen as racist. In the case of Jews, the term for such behavior is called anti-Semitism. When combined, as it is by anti-Zionists, with conspiratorial theories about Jewish

manipulation of the media or Congress (the Walt-Mearsheimer "Israel Lobby" canard), there is little doubt about the prejudicial nature of the effort.

Judith Butler, John Judis, Roger Waters, and Alice Walker can say whatever they want about Israel in a thousand other, often more prominent, forums than those in the Jewish community. But they are not entitled to have Jewish institutions honor or fund their anti-Israel hate. Upholding that principle isn't repression. It's just common sense.

<http://www.commentarymagazine.com/2014/02/21/anti-zionists-must-not-be-allowed-to-hijack-the-jewish-community/>

Andrew Bolt simply does not understand Marxism

By [Tristan Ewins](#) - posted Monday, 24 February 2014

Last week Herald-Sun columnist Andrew Bolt made a written assault against the reservation of any place for the [teaching of Marxism](#) in our universities: blaming Marxism for millions of deaths. He described it as a "totalitarian ideology". [Newsletter 745]

In response to Andrew: You're entitled to your opinion as a conservative to oppose Marxism, or leftism in general. But get your facts straight.

In the 19th Century Social Democratic - that is Marxist - parties were at the very forefront of the struggle for free, universal and equal suffrage in Europe. What is more, when the Marxist Left split during the 1914-1919 period Social Democratic Marxists opposed the Great War bloodbath; but also opposed the new 'Communism' as espoused by the Bolsheviks in Russia. Specifically, they resolutely opposed over-centralisation, one party dictatorship, militarisation of labour, the suppression of civil liberties, and the dissolution of the Russian constituent assembly. That's right: Marxists were amongst the most steadfast defenders of democracy. The Marxist Social Democrats understood the damage that would be done to the Social Democratic cause by desperate and authoritarian strategies that broke the traditional nexus between socialism, democracy and freedom.

Yet for Bolt Marxism is equated with 'totalitarianism' ; and there are arguments that 'socialism has been tried and it failed'.

Yes, Marxists tend to believe in 'totality' in the sense that the 'movement of economy and society as a whole' is held to be graspable at its core largely as a process of class struggle (for example, the liberal capitalists struggle against the old monarchist Absolutism; and the working class's struggle against exploitation by capitalists). But 'totality' is not the same as 'totalitarianism' - interpreted as overwhelming repression. Although some interpretations of Marxism insist on 'closure' in the sense that they believe the trajectory of society's development to be 'inevitable' (yet here also there were dissidents; eg: Eduard Bernstein; and also today's 'Post-Marxists').

Also, those who condemn Marxism rarely concede the atrocities committed for the sake of capitalism, and to smash the Left. Half a million murdered in Indonesia in 1965-66; 300,000 slain in Guatemala in the 1980s; the bloody coup against the democratically elected socialist Allende government in Chile 1973; and the Western role in bombing Cambodia - which precipitated the Khmer Rouge's seizure of power.

And today consider the oppression in [Bahrain](#) where the Shia ethnic majority is repressed, and in response to protests dissidents have been killed and jailed; and civil liberties are regularly violated. But Bahrain hosts a [US Naval Base](#) just as Syria hosts a Russian Naval Base.

Yes, it must be recognized that self-proclaimed 'Marxist' movements have at times degenerated into Stalinist oppression, terror and mass murder. The Khmer Rouge comes to mind; as does today's North Korean regime. But these have little in common with the democratic Marxists who early on perceived the danger posed by authoritarian and terroristic

strategies, as well as the danger posed by 'cults of personality'.

For examples of democratic Marxists: look to Julius Martov, Karl Kautsky, Max Adler and Otto Bauer. Further to the Left consider the position of Rosa Luxemburg. To summarize: all of these figures are notable for their opposition to war, and their criticisms of Bolshevik strategy and tactics. All these Marxists respected human freedom, and the need for participatory democracy as the embodiment of this freedom; but also because self-correction in democracies can best be promoted through the observance of those principles.

For another inspirational example of democratic Marxism in practice, look to the "Austro-Marxists" (members of the Austrian Social-Democratic Workers' Party - including Adler, Bauer and others) and their fight for democracy both before and after WWI.

The Austro-Marxist strategy included the development of social and cultural societies, associations and institutions. These included extensive public housing projects: "64,000 apartments constructed between 1923 and 1933", housing "one seventh of Vienna's population" at "5 per cent of a workers' wages". Also provided for were education services, child-care, libraries, health care, playgrounds, gymnasias, swimming and wading pools, meeting halls, youth facilities, carpentry shops, post-offices, cafes, lectures, music programs, symphony orchestras, choral societies and more. Furthermore, this 'institutional' strategy facilitated "an atmosphere of co-operation and solidarity" amongst the Viennese working class. What must kept in mind is that all this was achieved between 1919 and 1934 - a time frame where most of the advanced capitalist world's working class had no hope of aspiring to these kind of living standards; or the opportunities to engage in such cultural participation.

Unfortunately democracy in Austria was crushed in 1934 by the 'Austro-Fascist' dictatorship of Engelbert Dolfuss - following a brief civil war.

Marxism is *still* worth teaching for a number reasons.

First there is historical relevance - including the role of Leninist parties, and the possibility that social and economic breakdown could see a return of radical class struggle. But there is also the importance of observing the truth about the plurality of Marxist tendencies and movements - many of which were (and in some cases still are) deeply democratic.

Crucially, there are also Marxist insights that remain pertinent. Insights into alienation and the division of labour (with the consequence of a lack of creative power and 'self-realisation' enjoyed by working people); insights into the nature of exploitation (that is, workers receive a generally falling proportion of the proceeds of their labours under capitalism), and the tendency in capitalism towards monopoly (which is bad for democracy, and bad for consumers). Consequently, consider the importance of movements for economic democracy, full personal development and cultural participation; and movements for negotiated mutual disarmament and peace. There are still many reasons to teach Marxism today; though in the context of a pluralist curriculum

which pays equal attention to liberalism and other critical traditions.

Marxism is also often dismissed on the grounds that it "failed"; as epitomised by the collapse of the USSR and Eastern Bloc during 1989-1991. And yet at the time 'Perestroika' (democratic internal reform) and 'Glasnost' (systemic transparency and openness) under Mikhail Gorbachev (the USSR's former head of state) held the prospect of 'reforming Communism'. This was to involve a larger role for markets, civil liberties, pluralism, détente, and also disarmament and peace. But after the collapse of Gorbachev's efforts things arguably got worse in Russia- not better. A handful of 'Oligarchs' took over the economy - the means of production which had been built up by Russian and other workers without any input by capitalists over the course of more than 70 years. Today dissidents are still mysteriously murdered; others are jailed or driven into exile. And the destruction of socialist ideology in Russia has seen a return of Chauvinism and reactionary, illiberal and authoritarian politics. The world would have been much better off with a 'gradual interpenetration' of East and West (ending with an extended European Union merging with the Eastern and Southern areas of the USSR) - with Glasnost and Perestroika helping to ensure peace and liberty - but also equality. Instead of this today - look to the war in Syria ([approximately 140,000 dead](#)) - with the West effectively backing an opposition which includes extreme Islamic militias - and Russia supporting the authoritarian and repressive Syrian Government - and hence also (indirectly) Iran. There is a return to old style 'Great Power Politics' - 'The Global Chessboard'.

All this said, the threat to democracy in Australia today comes not from the Left but from the Right.

Recent editorialising by the Herald-Sun displays an intolerance for even low intensity civil disobedience. And laws pushed through by the Napthine State Liberal Government in Victoria [threaten freedom of assembly](#). The 'heavy hand of government' may result in up to two years jail for protestors. It is not going 'too far' to suggest liberal democracy is under threat in this country.

What alternative is there to democracy? What alternative to people being free to make their own mistakes - and hence learn from them?

In a real democracy the people never fully cede power to the State. A robust democracy involves a strong and participatory public sphere; a mobilised civil society. Everything from political parties and trade unions to social movements.

People readily dismiss dissenting interests (eg: unions). But look to the double standard where industrial liberties are ceded - and 'freedom' is reduced to 'free markets'...

Liberal rights are critical. I support Andrew Bolt's liberal rights funnily enough. But those liberal rights are hollowed out when in practice they come to apply overwhelmingly to the rights of 'the establishment.' And where educators who want to impart a critical disposition above all - are portrayed as 'trouble-makers' - or dismissed as Marxists. And because of pre-existing prejudices the media establishment feels it doesn't have to include those voices except at the outer periphery.

Marxist perspectives should be included in civil society and in curricula - alongside liberal, conservative and Green perspectives. Even fascism should be wrestled with - if for no other reason than that people understand what it is and how it came about in the past. Pluralism is the creed of any healthy democracy. Teaching people not only to understand their interests - but to wrestle with their beliefs and values - is also necessary.

Recent attacks against the ABC might also be understood in the sense that the accommodation of even moderate left perspectives potentially leads to a greater plurality of competing viewpoints - which is something the authoritarian Right fears.

It's time for a re-evaluation of the truth about the democratic Left. And it's time the Australian people made it clear they will not stand for the erosion of their liberal rights; or the erosion of the pluralism which is at the heart of any robust democracy.

References:

Gruber, Helmut, 'Red Vienna - Experiment in Working Class Culture 1919-1934', Oxford University Press, New York, 1991

Rabinbach, Anson, "The Crisis of Austrian Socialism - From Red Vienna to Civil War - 1927-1934", The University of Chicago Press, London, 1983

<http://www.onlineopinion.com.au/view.asp?article=16050&page=0>

WONDERS OF THE WORLD

By Rob Kerby, Senior Editor



With a natural increase in population of minus .8% annually, **Ukraine** is in danger of becoming an empty nation. Because of its extremely low birth rate and high mortality rate, between now and the year 2050, Ukraine is expected to lose around 30% of its population.



The world's two smallest nations, **Vatican City** with .17 of a square mile of territory and **Monaco** with .8 of a square mile, they are the smallest permanently inhabited nations in the world and would easily fit into Manhattan's Central Park.



Singapore is just one big city. It has no farms other than the occasional window-box garden. Monaco and the Vatican lack farms, too, but Singapore is the largest of the three city-nations.



Although English is the official language of the island nation of **Papua New Guinea**, only 1-2 percent of the population actually speaks it. Over 820 languages – 12 percent of the world's total – are spoken there.



With 50 percent of its population having graduated from high school and then gone on to at least one semester of college, **Canada** easily has the most educated population of any nation on Earth. It is followed by Israel at 45 percent and Japan at 44 percent.



With 99% of its vast territory country covered by the Sahara Desert, the oil-rich nation of **Libya** is one of the most arid places in the world. In some regions, decades may go by without a single drop of rain.



A nation with no government and on-going conflict between the many warlords that rule over its ruined cities, **Somalia** is a land of constant war. There is no law, no police, no army. It is basically dominated by street gangs who constantly compete for control of ever-shifting turfs – and who send out pirates to terrorize shipping off the African coast.



Producing a whopping 95 percent of the world's opium, not even 10 years of occupation by American forces have slowed down **Afghanistan's** illegal drug industry.



Siberia is home to approximately 25 percent of the world's forests – filling an area larger than the continental United States, making *Russia* the largest converter of carbon dioxide into breathable oxygen.



Surpassing even the United States and famously devout Poland, a higher percentage of citizens of the *Philippine Islands* regularly attend church than anywhere else in the world.



If, indeed, global warming increases, the country most likely to disappear beneath the waves is the *Maldives Islands*. With an average height of around six feet above sea level, their nation is the lowest on Earth.



With over 95 percent of its population overweight, the small island nation of *Nauru* is by far the most overweight country on Earth. Its obesity epidemic is primarily attributed to the importation of western fast food that coincided with an increased standard of living in the 20th century due to the global popularity of its phosphate exports.



Because *Guam* doesn't have any natural gravel, this island, which is actually a territory of the United States, makes asphalt for its roads using a mix of oil and ground-up coral. Some kinds of coral are considered semi-precious stones, but, no, not the coral used for Guam's gravel.



With only about 3,000 human inhabitants, the *Falkland Islands*, a British territory off the coast of Argentina, are home to approximately a half-million sheep. Not surprisingly wool is the major export.



China might dispute this claim, but *Egypt* is the oldest country in the world. Its existence as a nation goes back to 3100 B.C., the time of the formation of its first dynasty of Pharaohs. And yes, the pyramids apparently were ancient even back then!



With over 3 million lakes, nine percent of *Canada* is actually fresh water. Canada is the home for over 60 percent of all the lakes in the world.



At 4 people per square mile, *Mongolia* is the least densely populated country on Earth. Compare this to the Mong Kok district of Hong Kong that has the highest population density in the world with 340,000 people per square mile.



Sounds a bit strange doesn't it? For a country as big as *Saudi Arabia* there has to be at least some sort of flowing water. Well, there isn't. Most of their fresh water comes from desalinization plants or underground reservoirs. There is not a single river, creek or brook in the entire country.



Generally the world's youngest country is determined by calculating the portion of the population that is younger than 15. Presently it is *Niger* that holds this distinction with roughly half of its population having barely reached puberty – 49 percent.

<http://www.beliefnet.com/Entertainment/Galleries/9MoreTidbitsGeographyClassSkipped.aspx?p=3#lcRusseyjmuZPDQ8.99>

Christianity Judaism Islam Buddhism Hinduism
More Faiths

<http://www.beliefnet.com/>
